UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,788	01/19/2007	Martin James Drysdale	010180.00051	6505

22907 7590 04/21/2010

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1100 13th STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER	
MORRIS, PATRICIA L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/21/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/574,788	DRYSDALE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patricia L. Morris	1625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 May 2009 and 20 January 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *12,15 and 21-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *12,15 and 21-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5/15/09*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 12, 15 and 21-28 are under consideration in this application.

Election/Restrictions

The restriction requirement is deemed sound and proper and is hereby made FINAL.

This application has been examined to the extent readable on the elected compound and method of treating cancer wherein Ar^1 represents aryl and Q, R_2 –R4, R^A-R^C represent nonheterocyclic groups as set forth in claim 1, exclusively.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 are hereby withdrawn in view of applicants canceling all the compound claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC ∋ 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 12, 15 and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

No enablement can be found in the specification for the treatment of all cancers.

Contra to applicants' assertions in the instant response, applicants have failed to provide any objective evidence showing that the instant compounds treat all cancers. Mere allegations by counsel do not take the place of any objective evidence. Applicants assert that pages 18-21 recites lead candidates of Hsp 90 inhibitory activity. However, no cancer of any type is even

treated in the specification. The prepondence of the art of record clearly shows that there is only a limited understanding of the activities of Hsp 90 as it relates to its particular biological functions. For example, the role of Hsp 90 inhibitors in pancreatic cancer has not been studied. Yet applicants claim treatment of all pancreatic cancers.

The nature of the invention

The nature of the invention is drawn to the method of using the instant compounds in the treatment of cancer in which inhibition of Hsp 90 is required.

State of the Prior Art and the level of skill in the art

It is well recognized in the art that there is only a limited understanding of the activities of Hsp 90 as it relates to its particular biological functions. Zhao et al. (Biochem. Cell Biol., 83, pp. 703-710 2005) on page 703 recite that the mechanism of Hsp 90 function remains poorly understood. The number of identified Hsp90 client proteins is over 100 and is still quickly increasing. See Xiao et al.(Mini-reviews in Medicinal Chemistry, 2006, 6, 1137-1143) on page 1137. The art recognizes that specific some drugs may block progression of tumors and others will promote tumor formation. See Xiao et al. (Current Medicinal Chemistry, 2007, 14, 223-232) in section 6 on page 230 therein. Further, Chiosis (Expert Opin. Ther. Targets 10(1) 2006 , 37-50) teaches that the genetic plasticity of cancer cells often permits rapid development of resistance, even in patients who initially respond to targeted agents such as imatinib.

Predictability/unpredictability of the art.

The high degree of unpredictability is well recognized in Hsp 90 inhibition. The role of Hsp 90 inhibitors in pancreatic cancer has not been studied. Note the abstract of Song et al. (Mol. Cancer Ther. 2008, 7(10), 2008). Xiao et al. on page 1140, states that Hsp90 inhibitors

might be effective in killing end-stage tumors, but they might promote progression of early state tumors.The state of the prior art is that it involves screening *in vitro* and *in vivo* to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activities. There is no absolute predictability even in view of the seeming high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles established that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any treatment regimen on its face.

The amount of direction or guidance and the presence or absence of working examples

Again, the specification is silent as to whether if any compound treats all cancers..

The breadth of the claims

The breadth of the claims are drawn to the of any and all cancers.

The quantity of experimentation needed

In view of high degree of unpredictability in the art, the limited working example with no results and the fact that the breadth of the claims is not commensurate with that of any objective enablement and that the nexus between Hsp90 inhibition and all cancers has not been established, the quantity of experimentation needed would be undue when faced with the lack of direction and guidance present in the instant specification in regards to the compounds and pharmaceutical compositions.

The specification lacks direction or guidance for placing all of the alleged products in the possession of the public without inviting more than routine experimentation. Applicants are referred to In re Fouche, 169 USPQ 429 CCPA 1971, MPEP 716.02(b). Applicants are also referred to In re Wands, 858 f.2d 731,737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) which

includes the incorporation of the 8 factors recited in Ex parte Foreman, 230 USPQ 546 (Bd. Of App. and Inter 1986).

In terms of the 8 Wands factors, undue experimentation would be required to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure due to the breadth of the claims, the level of unpredictability in the art of the invention, and the poor amount of direction provided by applicants. Taking the above factors into consideration, it is not seen where the instant claim is enabled by the instant application.

Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S (CAFC) 42 USPQ2d 1001, states that "a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its successful conclusion" and "[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable."

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

No antecedent basis can be found for "R_4 represents $CONR^B(Alk)_nR^A$" in claim 28 because Claim 12 does not permit the carboxamide to be substituted. No antecedent basis can be found for the variable R^C in claims 10 and 11. Further, the variables R^B and R^C are not defined in claim 1.

The claims measure the invention. United Carbon Co. v, Binney & Smith., 55 USPQ 381 at 384, col. 1, end of 1st paragraph, Supreme Court of the United States (1942).

The U.S. Court of Claims held to this standard in Lockheed Aircraft Corp. v. United States, 193 USPQ 449, "Claims measure invention and resolution of invention must be based on what is claimed".

The C.C.P.A. in 1978 held "that invention is the subject matter defined by the claims submitted by the applicant. We have consistently held that no applicant should have limitations of the specification read into a claim where no express statement of the limitation is included in the claim": In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11, at 15.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Morris whose telephone number is (571) 272-0688. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Patricia L. Morris/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

plm
April 20, 2010